

**From:** Mark Pruner [mark@markpruner.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 02, 2008 11:50 PM  
**To:** Context, DeltaVision@CALFED  
**Cc:** mark@markpruner.com  
**Subject:** Comments to Draft Delta Vision Strategic Plan  
Delta Vision:

Here are comments from North Delta CARES:

We are certainly in agreement that less water should be taken from the Delta to be sent to Southern California, but suggest you may want to give more prominence to this in your Plan.

Given that you want less water south, please make it clear why a dual conveyance system is needed as both the courts and science seem to agree that what's best for fish and farmers is to send no water south.

It is not clear in the document what are the long-term benefits or consequences of designating the Delta as a federally recognized National Heritage Area and a multi-unit State Recreation Area. In fact the Plan document seems remarkably silent about the long-term consequences - political, economic and environmental - of most of its proposals. In the past, in other parts of California and other states, such Vision Plans have led to implementations by government and non-governmental organizations that have compromised both human and property rights that should never be repeated, these may be avoided by strong in-Delta public participation processes, which we strongly suggest you adopt before issuing a final draft. We also suggest that you include in future drafts a mechanism for periodic future review of Plan implementation with a strong public outreach component as we believe that the Plan treats as simple what is extremely complex and provides few analyses of economic or environmental benefits to those in-Delta and out.

Mark Pruner  
President, North Delta CARES